

_	AN U 8-2003			
PATER	& MANEWART	TRANSMITTAL LETTER (General - Patent Pending)	,	Docket No. 112740-033
In R	e Application Of: (	Otger Wewers		
هر.	Serial No. 09/509,588	Filing Date March 29, 2000	Examiner M. Milord	Group Art Unit 2685
Title	INTEGRATED (	CIRCUIT FOR A MOBILE RADIO	D DEVICE WITH CALL-AN	SWERING FUNCTION
			·	
		TO THE ASSISTANT COM	MISSIONER FOR PATENTS	S:
Transmitted herewith is:				
Response to Office Action on 2 pages and return receipt post card  JAN 0 9 2003				
		•	Te	echnology Center 2600
in the	as described belo Charge th Credit any	s required.	o charge and credit Deposit	Account No. 02-1818
Bell, I P.O. I Chica	Sick B. Law (Reg. No. Boyd & Lloyd LLC Box 1135 go, Illinois 60690 781-6801	gnature 41,549)	l certify that this on 1/3/03 first class/frout/ture	document and fee is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as er 37 F.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the

sioner for Patents, Washington, D.C.

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Robert Buccieri

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

cc:

JAN 0 8 2003 B

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#7

Applicants:

Otger Wewers

Appl. No.:

09/509,588

Filed:

March 29, 2000

Title:

INTEGRATED CIRCUIT FOR A MOBILE RADIO DEVICE WITH CALL-

ANSWERING FUNCTION

Art Unit:

2685

Examiner:

M. Milord

Docket No.:

112740-033

**RECEIVED** 

JAN 0 9 2003

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

**Technology Center 2600** 

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Dear Sir:

In response to the non-final Office Action of October 3, 2002, the Applicant submits the following remarks.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 3-10 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected.

Claims 3-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,276). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the following comments.

With respect to independent claim 3, the Office Action asserts that Thompson, *inter alia*, teaches the claimed feature of a digital voice memory with which a call-answering functionality that is enabled by a microcontroller. In support of this assertion, the memory 84 or 284 shown respectively in Figures 7 and 8 are purported to be equivalent to the claimed digital voice memory. Additionally, the Office Action also appears to correlate the program memory 184 with the claimed digital voice memory. None of these taught memories in Thompson, however meet the claimed elements.

In particular, the resident memories 84 and 284 shown in the embodiments of Figures 7 and 8 of Thompson are merely taught to contain resident applications in core software programs associated with either a handheld communication device 50 or a desktop telephone 150 (see col.